

### REMARKS

Claim 21 has been amended. No claims have been canceled are added by way of this response. Thus, claims 1-15 and 18-22 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### Response to Objections:

Applicant has corrected the claim 21 to replace the term "firewall" with "firewire" as suggested by the Examiner and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

#### Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 1-3, 8-16 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Ferry et al. (USPN 5,805,677) in view of Tidwell et al (USPN 6,535,590). Claims 4-6 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that this claim is obvious over Ferry in view of Tidwell and in view of Goldstein (USPN 5,410,326). Claims 18 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that this claim is obvious over Ferry in view of Tidwell and in view of Baker (USPN 5,948,080). Claims 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that this claim is obvious over Ferry in view of Tidwell, Baker and Goldstein. Applicant's Claim 1 recites:

the communication device is configured to automatically search for an active entertainment terminal in response to an activation of an administration mode of the communication device,

However, Ferry teaches sending the call to the television in response to receiving a call. A call refers to a telephone call for voice or data transmission between the communication device and a further communication device. It would be known by those skilled in the art that the administration mode allows for changes of settings of the communication device (see e.g. 5-17). Thus, the limitation in response to an activation of an administration mode cannot reasonably be construed as in response to receiving a call. The following is a quotation from MPEP 2143

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a

reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Furthermore, Claim 1 recites:

configuration information that provides information for configuring the communication device is sent from the communication device to the active entertainment terminal in response to finding an active entertainment terminal,

It would be known by those skilled in the art that configuring the communication device changes the settings of the communication device (see e.g. 5-17). The following is a quotation from MPEP 2111.01

This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless \*\*>the plain meaning is inconsistent with< the specification. ...[T]he ordinary and customary meaning of a claim term is the meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art in question at the time of the invention, *i.e.*, as of the effective filing date of the patent application.

The Examiner states that ‘synchronization of devices corresponds to “configuration of devices”’. Applicant respectfully submits that Ferry does not teach a synchronization of the devices but a synchronization of a caller signal and a video signal to form a composite video signal. The composite video is sent to the television to be displayed. The composite video signal sent to the television does not configure (change settings) of the communication device.

In view of the foregoing remarks Applicant respectfully submits independent claim 1 is patentable. In addition, for at least the reasons above, independent claim 21 is patentable. Furthermore, claims 2-15 and 18-20 that depend on claim 1 and claim 22 which depends on claim 21 are patentable at least based on their dependency as well as based on their own merits.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-15-2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Janet D. Hood  
Registration No. 61,142  
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830